

to keep them as two races. The characters relied on by Robinson and Kloss, *i. e.* the yellow forehead, yellow lores and eyebrow, and yellower upper tail-coverts, are purely individual, and Dr. Hartert and I have carefully examined the specimens in the Tring Museum together and agree that the characteristics are of no sub-specific value.

Distribution. Malay Peninsula; mountainous country only.

VI.—Some Remarks on the Names of certain Birds.

By CLAUD B. TICEHURST, M.A., M.R.C.S., B.C., M.B.O.U.

IN spite of all that has been written of recent years by expert nomenclaturists on what names have priority for each species, there are, and must be for years to come, a good many names which are still being used incorrectly even by the strictest priorists, since even in my small sphere of work a few have come under my notice, and I have thought that it would be desirable to call attention to them.

1. THE YELLOW-BROWED WARBLER.—This is the *Motacilla superciliosa* of Gmelin, the *Phylloscopus superciliosus* of most authors. Unfortunately, as pointed out by Messrs. Mathews and Iredale (Austral Avian Rec. vol. iii. pp. 44-5, Dec. 1915), the *Motacilla superciliosa* of Gmelin is not the same species as the *Motacilla superciliosa* of Boddaert, 1783, and so, of course, *superciliosa* cannot be used for this Warbler. Messrs. Mathews and Iredale failed to find a synonym which could be used instead, and (*loc. cit.*) they proposed the name *premium* for this bird, which would then become *Phylloscopus humei premium*, and this name has been adopted in the B. O. U. List, 2nd Ed., 1915, etc.

These nomenclatorial explorers, however, need not have looked beyond Yarrell (Ed. iv. p. 445, footnote) to have got on the right track, and a little further search would have led them to Blyth's 'Catalogue of the Birds in the Museum of the Asiatic Society' p. 184, and so to J. A. S. B. xi. p. 191,

where Blyth gave an excellent description of this bird under the name of *Regulus inornatus*. Blyth says that the locality of his specimen was unknown, but he was informed that the species inhabits the vicinity of Darjeeling; in his Catalogue written seven years later he says it is common in Lower Bengal, and places it as a synonym of *modestus* of Gould (a name which many older authors seemed to have used impartially for *proregulus* and *superciliosus*, auct.), as he found it was simply *superciliosus* in worn dress. Gould's plate of *modestus* is none too good, but I do not think there can be any doubt that it represents *proregulus*. Blyth's description of his *inornatus* fits well the *superciliosa* of Gmelin, and does not fit any other *Phylloscopus* which inhabits Darjeeling and Lower Bengal. Moreover, in Mr. J. H. Gurney's copy of Blyth's Catalogue there is written in pencil in Blyth's own handwriting against *R. inornatus* "superciliosus Gmelin"! In future, therefore, the name of this bird should be known as *Phylloscopus inornatus inornatus* (Blyth), J. A. S. B. xi. 1842, pp. 191-2.

2. EASTERN YELLOW WAGTAIL.—This bird has masqueraded for years as *Motacilla flava campestris* Pallas, how and why it is hard to say. It is not the *Motacilla campestris* of Linnæus, 10th ed. p. 184. The next name available appears to be *flavifrons* of Severtzow ('Stray Feathers,' iii. Nov. 1875, p. 424). Whether *flavifrons* and *rayi* are to be regarded as racial forms of *flava* or not is, I think, a moot point.

3. THE OLIVACEOUS WILLOW-WARBLER.—This is the *Phylloscopus indica* of authors and the *Sylvia indica* of Jerdon 1840, but not the *Sylvia indica* of Vieillot 1817, which is a *Tarsiger*. The next oldest name would seem to be *Phylloscopus griseolus* Blyth (J. A. S. B. xvi. 1874, p. 443: Hugli River at Calcutta).

4. THE KASHMIR RED-BREASTED FLYCATCHER.—This is the *Siphia hyperythra* of Cabanis (J. f. O. 1866, p. 391) and also of many other authors. So long as this Flycatcher and its allies are kept in the genus *Siphia*, the name *hyperythra* can

stand, but Sharpe (Cat. B. M.), Legge ('Birds of Ceylon'), and Dr. Hartert (Vög. pal. F.) all put this little group into the genus *Muscicapa*. Now *Muscicapa hyperythra* cannot be used for this bird, as this association has already been used by Blyth (J. A. S. B. xi. 1842, p. 885,) for quite a different bird—one of the Blue Flycatchers—known as *Cyornis hyperythrus*. Those who would put these Flycatchers in the genus *Muscicapa* must find a new name for this bird; those who do not, can use *hyperythra*—a good instance, and not the only one, of a well-nigh insuperable difficulty which must be overcome ere we reach the millennium in uniformity of nomenclature.

5. THE EASTERN SKY-LARK.—In the Journal f. Ornith. of 1903 p. 149, Ehmecke described this Sky-Lark, which has an enormous breeding-range in western Siberia and Turkestan and an equally vast winter range in southern Asia, as *Alauda cinerea*, and a year later in the same publication changed the name to *cinerascens*, as *Alauda cinerea* was preoccupied in Gmelin's Syst. Nat. As *Alauda arvensis cinerascens* this has crept into recent literature and lists. Now in 1844, Hodgson used the name *dulcivox* in Gray's Zool. Misc. (p. 84) for an Indian Sky-Lark without giving any description, and consequently his name is a *nomen nudum*. Brooks ('Stray Feathers,' Dec. 1873, pp. 484-5) used *dulcivox* to describe "the only Indian Sky-Lark having a general resemblance to the European *Alauda arvensis*": in other words he described, and well described, the Sky-Lark of the *arvensis* group, which is common enough in the plains of India in winter. He goes on to say it is monticolous in summer, and calls it "a well marked Alpine Lark." In 'The Ibis,' 1892, p. 61, he says: "the large Lark of the Punjab is certainly not *A. arvensis*, and *A. dulcivox* should be kept distinct." So there is no doubt at all to what Sky-Lark Brooks referred. Dr. Hartert (Vög. pal. F. p. 247) against *Alauda dulcivox* Brooks puts the type-locality as "Alpine Region of North India." Now Brooks never said that this bird came from and bred in the Alpine regions of

North India, though, of course, he probably meant it. The next question is: Does an *arvensis* breed in the Himalayas, and, if so, is it different from the Siberian breeding bird? Mr. Whistler and I have for some years searched the literature on the subject, and although we have found plenty of statements regarding the alleged breeding of this bird there, on examination it has invariably been proved that the authors had mistaken a *gulgula* for *arvensis*. I could only find one author, Mr. J. Davidson, who had recorded both *arvensis* and *gulgula* breeding (in Kashmir); he kindly sent me his supposed *arvensis*, and it, too, turned out to be a *gulgula* (*guttata*). Mr. Whistler also, and his numerous correspondents in the Himalayas have failed to produce a breeding *arvensis* from those mountains, nor are there any among the huge series in the British Museum, nor in the Tring Museum. One is forced, therefore, to the conclusion that a breeding *arvensis* in the "Alpine Region of North India" is a myth. The question then arises: Do the winter birds from the plains of India differ in any way from the Sky-Larks of Siberia in similar plumage? and I cannot see that they do so. Therefore this eastern Sky-Lark should in future be called *Alauda arvensis dulcivox* Brooks, and *cinerascens* Ehmecke becomes a synonym.

Whilst on the subject of Himalayan Sky-Larks, I may call attention to a curious statement by Mr. Richmond. In a list of birds of Kashmir (Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus. xviii. p. 467) he gives *Alauda arvensis intermedia* as a breeding bird in that country. He explains that it is the *Alauda guttata* of other authors, but that as Kashmir and Shanghai (the type-locality for *intermedia*) birds are the same, *intermedia* has priority. I cannot agree—Swinhoe's *intermedia* belongs to the *arvensis* group, and is considerably larger and of quite a different colour to Brooks's *guttata*, which belongs to the *gulgula* group. Richmond, of course, wrote this as long ago as 1895, when these Larks were not so well understood as they are now; and so it is all the more surprising to find that Mr. Stuart Baker has recently perpetuated Richmond's error (Journ. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. xxvii. p. 740).